

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant appreciates the allowability of claims 1-6 and 15-20.

Claims 7-8, 10 and 21-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,426,424 to Vanden Heuvel et al. (hereinafter "Vanden Heuvel") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,892 to Helferich (hereinafter "Helferich"). For the following reasons, the rejection is again respectfully traversed.

Applicant has previously argued against the rejection on the basis that there is an insufficient showing of a proper motivation or suggestion in the prior art to make the proposed combination and/or modifications of the teachings of Vanden Heuvel and Helferich. That argument is hereby renewed but, for the sake of brevity, it is not reiterated herein.

Further, regarding claims 7 and 21, neither Vanden Heuvel nor Helferich teaches or suggests erasing the messages *when designated character sequences are contained in the received messages*, as required. In the Office Action, with reference to Helferich the Examiner states that,

One of ordinary skilled in the art understand that a user select an erase function after the received message is read, the received message is marked in order for the paging transceiver CPU knows that a particular message is erased after the process function is performed. Therefore, Helferich teaches or suggests deleting a message once it is checked by the user.

Applicant agrees that it is well known for users to manually erase a message after having read it. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the present claims require not merely that the user flag messages for deletion, but rather that messages are automatically deleted by the radio paging receiver in response to *designated character sequences* being contained in the *received message*. Since the designated character sequences must be contained in the message as *received*, a deletion flag added to a message after reception does not satisfy the claim limitation as written. Thus, even if Vanden Heuvel were combined with Helferich, since each of the limitations of the claims are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, claims 7 and 21 and their respective dependent claims 8, 10 and 22-24 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 9, 11-14 and 25-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Vanden Heuvel in view of Helferich and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,239,679 to Murai (hereinafter "Murai"). For the following reasons, the rejection is again respectfully traversed.

For the above-mentioned reasons, neither Vanden Heuvel nor Helferich teaches or suggests every limitation of claims 7 and 21, from which each of the rejected claims respectively depends. Murai does not teach or suggest the above-identified deficiencies of Vanden Heuvel and Helferich. Therefore, even if Vanden Heuvel, Helferich and Murai were combined, every limitation of the claims is not taught or suggested. Thus, claims 7 and 21 and their respective dependent claims 9 and 25-28 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Appl. No. 09/332,298  
Amdt. Dated July 1, 2003  
Reply to Office action of April 8, 2003

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2750

Claim 11 has been amended herein to specify that the designated character sequences are contained in the message data picked up by the first decoding means. Thus, as amended, the claim requires that the designated character sequences were encoded in the radio signal, not added later by a user. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 7 and 21, claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-14 are patentable over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 31812.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

526 Superior Avenue, East  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484  
(216) 579-1700  
Date: July 1, 2003